

A
283.71
X

THE
CONSOLIDATION
OF THE
CHURCH IN CANADA.

A PLEA FOR A
GENERAL SYNOD WITH LEGISLATIVE POWERS,
FROM THE NORTH WEST.

— * * —

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REV.

Lord Bishop of Ontario,

BY THE

BISHOP OF QU'APPELLE,

ASSINIBOIA, N. W. T.

.....
In Union, Strength.
.....

PRICE—FIVE CENTS.

— J. P. CLOUGHER, PUBLISHER, TORONTO. —

Qu'Appelle, N. W. T.

RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD, AND DEAR BROTHER.

I have read with much interest your Address to the Synod of your Diocese concerning the Winnipeg Conference on the Consolidation of the Church in British North America.

As that part of your Address has been published by itself in pamphlet form, I presume that you desire it to be considered as addressed not merely to your own Diocese but to the Church in Canada generally. And the great importance of the subject, and the scheme you suggest, instead of that put forth by the Winnipeg Conference, certainly fully justifies such a step.

I trust, therefore, that you will not think that I am presuming if I venture to address you publicly with a few remarks on your comments on the scheme put forth by that Conference. I feel, indeed, that it may seem somewhat presumptuous in me to do so, when I remember the length of time that you have been a Bishop in this country, and the prominence of the position that you so worthily occupy, and my own very short service and my comparatively insignificant position. Nevertheless I feel that the question is one of such very grave importance to the future of our Church in this country that all personal considerations should be put aside. And I trust that the deep interest that I have felt in the question ever since I came to the country, and the fact that I am forced to regard it, in my distant and comparatively isolated sphere of work, from an altogether different point of view from which it is, perhaps, possible for you, from the centre of the Church life in the country, to look upon it, and because I fear that your great influence and authority may through this Address, be the means of postponing for a long period, if not of altogether thwarting hopes that seemed nearer being realized than could have been thought possible a few years ago, may be a sufficient excuse for any presumption there may be in my action.

As I read your Address I could not help feeling that your main argument against the Winnipeg scheme was based on an entire misapprehension (pardon me for so saying) of the real object and purpose of a General Synod as therein proposed.

You say (page 2) "The object of creating the Conference was to consolidate, that is to unify, the isolated Provinces in the Dominion, and *to prevent the possibility of their drifting asunder in the course of time, not only in minor practices, but in fundamental truth*"; and again, near the end of your address (page 7) you recur to, and emphasize these latter words, as your chief idea with regard to the proposed General Synod, "Bearing in mind that the main, *indeed the only*, [the italics here, and above are mine] *raison d'être* for the existence of a General Synod is as a precaution against a possible conflicting legislation by Provinces, it seems to me etc. etc.". I wondered for some time from what document it was that you were quoting the words placed in inverted commas, and which seemed to you sufficient to prove that this was the "main, indeed the ONLY reason for the existence of a General Synod." I had no recollection of any such words put forth in any resolution or official document of the Conference. I should certainly have felt it my duty most strongly to protest against them had they been put forth in any way by the Conference. On reading over the "*Record of the Proceedings*," however, I find that these words are quoted from the speech of the Bishop of Toronto (as Chairman of the Committee of the Synod of the Provinces of Canada) at the opening of the Conference. But, surely, the *purpose* of what is proposed to be done by a great Conference like that assembled at Winnipeg should not be judged by the mere words of any one person, however important may have been the position which he may have had to occupy thereat, but rather by the resolutions and official acts of the Conference itself. To my mind, however, even the words of the Bishop of Toronto, when taken with their context, do not at all bear the meaning that you have placed upon them. He said "The object of the Conference was that they might devise some scheme of union. * * * He expressed the profoundest conviction of every member of the Church of England in the scattered Diocese of the importance of the Church in Canada *being able on all great moral and religious questions to give one decided, unanimous voice*". And then he added (as the expression of his opinion). "When the Church was separated, into isolated provinces, with nothing to bind them together, there was a possibility of their drifting asunder in the course of time, not merely in minor practices, but

in fundamental truth." This seems to me very widely different from saying, or even implying, that the "main, indeed the only" reason for the existence of the General Synod, was, even in the opinion of the speaker, "to prevent the possibility of the isolated Provinces drifting asunder." The main object was evidently thought to be to unify for the purpose of being able to give "one unanimous, decided voice in all great moral and religious questions." The prevention of the possibility of drifting asunder was an advantage of certainly great importance that would probably be one of the results of that unification. But whatever may be the true interpretation of the words of the Bishop of Toronto, the purpose of acts done by the Conference should be judged, as I have said, by the words of the Conference itself. And the resolutions there passed most certainly prove that the object of the consolidation into one duly organized body was of far wider scope than the mere prevention of a possible drifting asunder. The *real* object, far from being only, as you say, a precaution against conflicting legislation, was, rather, to give the Church A POWER OF INITIATING, AND CARRYING ON UNITED ACTION, in all matters that concern her temporal and spiritual welfare as one Body in our one Dominion,—a power that the Church does not possess now. A glance at the objects proposed to be within the scope of action of the General Synod will show I think sufficiently that this was the chief object for which it is desired to create such a body.

Resolution 5 says—"The General Synod shall have power to deal with all matters affecting in any way the general interest and well being of the Church within its jurisdiction. * * *

The following or such like objects may be suggested as properly coming within the jurisdiction of the General Synod :—

- a.—Matters of doctrine, worship and discipline.
- b.—All agencies employed in the carrying on of the Church work.
- c.—The missionary and educational work of the Church.
- d.—The adjustment of relations between Dioceses in respect to widows and orphans of Clergy and superannuation funds.
- e.—Regulations of transeference of Clergy from one Diocese to another.

- f.—Education and training of candidates for Holy Orders.
- g.—Constitution and powers of an Appellate Tribunal.
- h.—The erection, division or re-arrangement of Provinces."

I am quite at a loss to understand how any one, who has read the above list, which is the official declaration of the Conference at Winnipeg, of the objects which might properly come within the jurisdiction of the General Synod, could possibly imagine that the sole object for the creation of such a body was to prevent disruption, or how any one could suppose that the creation of a Appellate Tribunal, as you propose, would satisfy those who desire the consolidation of the Church, when the creation of such a tribunal is mentioned in that resolution as one—but only one—out of about a dozen objects of such a General Synod.

What we desire, if I may venture to speak for a moment in the name of those who desire the creation of a General Synod, is that there should be a body properly representing the Church of England—(may I not say rather the Church Catholic of Canada, for that is what we are)—throughout the whole of this Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, able to speak with authority in the name of the Church not of the Province of Eastern Canada alone, but of Ruperts Land, and of the Diocese of British Columbia, in all matters of Dominion legislation that may touch upon ecclesiastical or moral relationships, and able also to *act* whether in any internal legislation that may be required, or in practical works of utility, in all matters that affect the welfare of the whole body. Why should we be the only religious body in the Dominion that cannot do this? You say that it "cannot be said that the [present] Provincial system has proved a failure." For my part I cannot say that I am by any means content with the position that our Church occupies in this country in comparison with the other religious bodies. When we take into account its spiritual claims, and the prestige of its position in the old country, and the wealth which it was able to draw upon there, it ought to occupy the foremost position amongst religious bodies instead of being *fourth* in numbers in relation to the population. I am not presumptuous enough to venture to attempt to assign any cause of this miserable position (as I must call it) that we occupy, but still I cannot help feeling that the isolation of

the various parts of our Church, and the impossibility of united action under our present conditions, has had something to do with our weakness.

The Roman schism (I call it so advisedly for though it may have existed in this country before our Church, by its novel terms of communion, and its subjection to a foreign Bishop, contrary to all ancient Canons of the Catholic Church, it has created a schism in the Catholic Church,) has the power of a united body, and as we all know uses it with tremendous effect as a political engine for the furtherance of its own ends. The Presbyterians, and the Methodists, also each act as one united body throughout the Dominion, and they are able therefore to throw their force into places where, from time to time, it seems to be most needed for the future welfare of the body.

Perhaps we, in these distant regions feel the loss of this want of cohesion and united action, in the practical working of the Church, more than it is possible for any one living in the older and more settled parts of Canada, to do. Let me illustrate my meaning by a few examples of what I consider would be the benefit of the consolidation of the Church with a central power of action, in practical matters.

The evangelization of our large heathen population and all that naturally belongs to it, it seems to me, ought certainly to be regarded as the responsibility of the Church of this country at large, and ought not to be thrown upon individual Dioceses. The consequence of our present system is that the responsibility for this work falls heaviest just on those Dioceses that are least able to do much for themselves. Of course I am not now speaking of the purely Missionary jurisdictions that are supported entirely for such work, but of Diocese like this, Ruperts Land, Calgary and New Westminster, that have to struggle to keep up the ministrations of religion amongst our own people, and yet have the largest heathen population, whom the Church ought to endeavour to evangelize. Ought not this, and the establishment of schools for the Indians, to be considered a work for which the whole Church is responsible? It never can be till the Oneness of our Church is more fully realized, and till there is a central organization.

Again, the Clergy are the executive officers of the Church, and not merely of this or that Diocese. Why should such funds as those for their superannuation, and for

their widows and orphans be confined to individual Diocese? Very evidently such funds would be made more solid and beneficial in proportion to the extension of their constituency, while it seems a hardship without excuse that Clergy working in small Dioceses, where it is impossible to organize such funds, should be deprived of their benefit.

But, important as such matters of organization are for the well-being of the Church, I think that there are other questions for the settlement of which it is still more vitally important that the Church should be able to speak and to legislate as one body. I mean such questions as are comprised in those suggested first by the Conference as "properly coming within the jurisdiction of the General Synod," viz: "Matters of doctrine, worship and discipline."

Take the Marriage Laws. It seems to me no less than a grievous scandal and a great hardship to the members of our Church that in one country there should be diversity of practice allowable on this most important subject—e.g., that in one Diocese there should be stringent regulations as to the necessity of the observance of the Table of Affinity, and as to the re-marriage of divorced persons, while in another even Clergymen should be allowed to marry a deceased wife's sister.

Take again the question of the restoration of a godly discipline for Clergy and Laity. There is nothing our Church needs more for her welfare, I believe, than such a return to more primitive practice in this matter, as was effected in other things at the Reformation. But it must be done by the whole Church of the country not by fragments thereof. It is worse than useless to attempt it in one Diocese if there is laxity in other parts of the same Church.

But further, the time is fast approaching, I believe, when the Church in this country, as in other colonies of our empire, will have to exercise its rights and prerogatives, and therefore responsibilities, as an independent branch of the Catholic Church in matters of Ritual, if not of Doctrine.

Is it right, is it a justifiable or worthy policy that we who have the right and the power to act with the independence that the Catholic Church has always regarded as inherent in national Churches, and therefore also have the responsibility of refusing to act, should for ever be con-

tent to wait upon the action of the Church at home, which is cramped and bound by its legal connection with the secular power in the State, which owing to the secular legislation of the last hundred years has got into a miserable condition of confusion?

I most fully and heartily agree with what you say—that “*The day for enforcing rigid uniformity is past and gone.*” What our Church most greatly needs is some freedom from the rigid bonds of the Act of Uniformity—some power of adaptability to the varied circumstances of our people—an official recognition of the fact that a service that is best adapted for the worship of Almighty God in a the Cathedral Church of a city like Kingston, is not of necessity the best adapted to the requirements of a service amongst the wild tribes of our North American Indians. And yet this is undoubtedly the condition under which we have volutarily bound ourselves at the present moment. I may be told that *practically* the Clergy do adapt themselves to circumstances and use other Forms than those prescribed in the Prayer Book when needed, as e.g. in Mission Services. But this does not alter the fact that it is really *illegal* for them to do so, for they are obliged to make a solemn declaration at their Ordination in conformity with the Act of Uniformity that in public prayer “they will use the form in the said book prescribed and *none other*, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.”

We need relaxation from a strict Uniformity that is not applicable to our case—but such relaxation should be *by authority* of the Church, and not a mere license for any Clergyman to do what he may consider right in his own eyes *contrary to law*.

But whether the time has yet come for *exercising* our right and responsibilities in the enlargement of our Ritual Law, may be a legitimate question. It cannot, however, be reasonably doubted, I think, that the time must come before long when the timid policy of inaction will be no longer possible,—and when the Church will be *obliged*, whether she likes it or not, to act for herself. Woe be to her if when that time comes she is still unprepared for such action, and has to set herself in order suddenly—for *that special purpose*, and in a time perhaps of excited feeling.

I have the fullest faith in the Divine guidance in the

Councils of the Church. But I confess that I think that the greater the number of Dioceses that are represented in such Councils, and the larger the area from which they are gathered together, the more free they are likely to be from party and local bias and prejudice, and the more open to the influences of that Divine guidance, which while it leads all compels none.

I notice that you object 1st that there is "*no precedent*" for a threefold grade of Synod in a National Church—that "it is an *innovation* of a most serious kind—that it does not harmonize with the practice of the Primitive Church," and (2) that "co-existence of Provincial Synods with a General one, practically means the abolition of the former." Let me say a few words about the second objection first. You may perhaps be aware that previous to, and at, the Conference at Winnipeg I did all I could to urge the establishment of a General Synod *instead* of our present Provincial Synods, i. e., practically to make the whole of Canada *one Province*. I did so, because while most earnestly desiring the consolidation of the Church throughout the whole of the Dominion I did not see the utility of a third Synod between the National and the Diocesan, and because I consider that "too much legislation is as bad as too little." I fully appreciated, however, the very strong objection felt by many to doing away with Provinces that had been already created, although, personally, I may have considered this more a sentimental than a practical objection; and, moreover, it was evident that the majority of this Province would not consent to the creation of a General Synod, except on the condition that the Provincial system was retained. When, in the issue, all matters that I considered as of at all any importance were given over "as properly coming within the jurisdiction of the General Synod," I thought that all I had really contended for was granted, and that if those who desired the retention of the present Provincial system were content with the minor duties left to those Synods and the ratification of the Acts of the General Synod, it would be a mere matter of sentiment on my part any longer to express even an objection. There is, undoubtedly, *real distinct* work still left for the Provincial Synods. The only question is whether it is of such a character as to make it worth while to maintain the machinery. However, those who advocate the present Provincial system say that it is,

and I, at least am content. I do not think that "it means the abolition" of the Provincial system, but it *does mean* that the General Synod shall have the power of taking in hand much that, so far as I am aware, the Provincial Synods have never, or but very imperfectly, attempted to touch. Moreover, I would point out that as the representation to the General Synod is to be direct from the Diocese, the present "Provinces of Canada" could, under the Winnipeg scheme, if it so desired, resolve to discontinue its Synod. As the scheme formulated at Winnipeg does not make it obligatory on the Dioceses at present independent to form themselves into a Province, so neither can it be thought to oblige Eastern Canada to continue its Provincial system. All that our Province *could* insist upon is that *our* Province should not be dismembered, but that *we* should still be allowed to exercise those privileges and duties which by the terms of the Constitution approved were reserved for Provincial Synods. The only real difficulty arising out of the Constitution as proposed, if the "Province of Canada" was desolved, would be the question of the "Primacy." But this I cannot doubt could be somehow arranged by the General Synod. I only urge it as worthy of consideration, that *if* the majority in the Provincial Synod of Canada consider that there is no necessity for three grades of Synods, there is nothing in the proposed Constitution of the General Synod—or in any Resolution passed at Winnipeg—that could *compel* them to maintain the existence of that Synod, as long as they did not interfere with the existence of ours.

The first objection to which I have alluded is undoubtedly a very strong one, at all events to my mind, if it can be really sustained.

I have the very strongest feeling that we ought to endeavour to the utmost to act in accordance with the "Practices of the Primitive Church," an appeal to which you justly remark "is the basis and justification of the English Reformation," and that what "does not harmonise" therewith ought to be avoided. But is it really the fact that this gradation of Synods is so altogether out of "*harmony*" with the practice of the Primitive Church? That we cannot find anything exactly similar to it I fully admit. But that does not prove that it is out of *harmony* with the then practice. It seems to me that beyond Dio-

ceses and General Councils of the Bishops and Presbyters of the *whole Church*, which may be said to have Apostolic authority, all other divisions of the Church such as Provinces, Patriarchates, Exarchates were simply ecclesiastical adaptations and divisions of the Church's system for the better organization of the Church as the need arose, and usually the outward organization of the Church followed the civil divisions of the country. The civil division of this country is certainly quite different to anything that existed in the Primitive times of the Church. I do not, therefore think that we are doing anything out of *harmony* with the Primitive Church if we adapt the external organization of our Church to the modern requirements of our country so as to be able to act more as a united body, especially in our unfortunate inability to have the benefit of Patriarchal, or General, Councils. With regard to the precedent of England our Metropolitan well remarked in his Address to his Synod last year, "As to the statement that such a superior General Synod is unprecedented, it is quite true that National Synods of the Church of England corresponding in a measure to our proposed General Synod were only called irregularly and on comparatively rare occasions, but the times are different. It is more easy now to bring together such a body, and the holding of it is agreeable to the spirit of the age. But the *principles of the General Synod is to be seen in the Nation Synods, and we have but to carry it out.* It will probably not be long before there will be some kind of National Synod meeting regularly in England, but without eliminating the Provincial Convocations. The last great speech of Archbishop Magee, addressed to the Convocation of York, advocated such a measure."

It seems to me, indeed, that there is a departure far more out of harmony with the practice of the Primitive Church, "an appeal to which is the basis and justification of the English Reformation," than any re-adjustment of the grades of Synods possibly could be, and that is in the *constitution of our Synods*. The admission of the Laity into Councils that are empowered to deal with questions of Doctrine and Ritual is certainly an "innovation" entirely out of harmony with the practices of the Primitive Church, and one which may well cause the most serious apprehension as to its results. The late Rev. James Wayland Joyce, one of the highest authorities on matters con-

nected with the Councils of the Church, once wrote to me "such a solecism in Church government was unknown till more than 1700 years after Christ." If for no other reason the perils of such an innovation might be recognised from the simple fact that the Laity as a body have received no special training or education in theology or even ecclesiastical history and practice. What would be thought if it was proposed to submit the laws under which Doctors or Lawyers act in their several professions to a mixed body of Physicians and Laymen, or Lawyers and Laymen, with an equal power of deciding what was the right course of procedure? But, further than this, the Christian Church has from the first held that to certain persons within that Church is given authority, by virtue of a Commission received from Christ Himself, to teach and instruct and to be "Stewards" of His Mysteries. Is it not an utter inversion of that "principle," and a most dangerous experiment, to say the least, to submit questions that involve what that teaching shall be and the manner in which it shall be expressed outwardly to the eye in acts of worship, to those whom the Clergy on all other occasions are commissioned to teach?

It is, I confess, my fervent hope that before it becomes necessary to submit any such questions to the General Synod the Laymen of our Church may have been so educated in Church Truth and Primitive Practices, that they may gladly recognize the wisdom and the rightfulness of leaving such questions to be decided by a Synod constituted in the manner of the early Synods of the Church, and be content with sanctioning what might be done thereat with their approval in accordance with what we read of the first Council held at Jerusalem. (Acts xv.)

But if this is, under present circumstance, impossible, I should be willing to concede even this fundamental departure from harmony with Primitive Practices, rather than that the Church should be altogether debarred from independent action as the Church of this country, which action I believe to be so necessary for her vitality and growth. For, I can believe that God can and will overrule even such a change in the government of His Church for good, sooner than I can believe that He will bless contentment with inaction.

You allege some minor objections such as—

(a) That "the Dioscesan Synods will have to bear the weight of expense incurred by the superincumbent Synods."

(b) That "the proposed Representation of Dioceses in the General Synod is according to the Clerical population."

With regard to *a* it is evident that any burden or expense must fall on the individual members of the Church and the Diocesan Synod seems to be the only means available of reaching the individual members. With regard to *b* there was very considerable difference of opinion about the representation of Dioceses, and after a prolonged debate the decision arrived at seemed to the majority to be the most practical, if not the best. It seemed absurd that such a Diocese as Mackenzie River, or Moosonee with only 3 or 4 Clergy should have, even nominally, the same representation as, say Toronto or Ontario. Perhaps one great cause of this difficulty is the creation of Dioceses in our Church where it would seem more appropriate to have "Missionary Jurisdictions." Anyhow such a matter as this can easily be adjusted by the General Synod when it meets. No one can suppose that the General Synod after it has once met will consider itself bound forever by the suggestions of the Winnipeg Conference. Its first duty, I imagine, would be to consider any amendments in its Constitution that may have been proposed by various Diocesan and Provincial Synods that, while agreeing to the general principle of a General Synod and to the proposals of the Winnipeg Conference as a sufficient basis for the first meeting, have signified their desire for certain alterations.

Knowing how much you have at heart the true welfare of the Church in this country I have ventured to put before you this plea for the need of a General Synod able to initiate and to carry on work for the whole of the Church in the Dominion, and not merely to be a Court of Appeal, as it appears to one in the comparatively isolated position of this great North West, in the humble but earnest hope that even yet you may see your way for the sake of the scattered brethren, even if there is no need in Ontario, to withdraw the powerful influence of your opposition to a scheme that drawing us all closer together will, I am sure, be productive of much good to our Church—to its weakest parts of course chiefly, but in a reactive measure also to the strongest, for it is a fundamental law of the Christian

brotherhood that one member cannot suffer or be weak, without the whole body feeling the baneful effects.

Believe me,

Ever yours sincerely in our Lord

ADELBERT,

Bishop of Qu'Appelle.

P.S.—I hope that no one will be so frightened at what I have said about the Laity voting on questions of Doctrine and Ritual, in the General Synod, as to prefer not to have a General Synod to the risk of the Laity not being allowed to take the fullest share in it when it is once created. What I have said is clearly only my own private opinion on the matter—though I certainly do feel very strongly the peril of the innovation for which we are indebted to the precedent set by the Church in the United States. It is obvious, however, that the Constitution of the General Synod as now proposed, and submitted by the Conference at Winnipeg, gives to the Laity a perfectly free and *equal voice in all matters*, and that, therefore, if that Constitution is approved, the withdrawal of questions of Doctrine and Ritual from them could only be effected *by their own action*, when they had become convinced that it was contrary to the primitive laws and practices of the Church that they should have jurisdiction in such matters. No one could reasonably object to this.

I give two quotations to fortify what I have said on this subject.

“Matters of Doctrine were always exclusively decided or attested by those whom the Apostles left to succeed to such portion of their office, us uninspired men could discharge—the Bishops of the Universal Church.” “The Laity were present as witnesses, not even as Jury, much less as Judge.” “The amount of evidence that Bishops alone had a definite voice in Synods, is, throughout the history of the Church, in proportion to the details in which the account of those Synods is given.”—Dr. Pusey *Councils of the Church*, Preface p. xiii. pp. 83.34.

“As to the great Constitutional question that the Laity have no *right* at all to vote in Synods properly so called is a conclusion which comes out to my mind only the more plainly the more one examines what is alleged the other way.”—Rev. J. Keble's Letters p. 298.

On the other hand, the following words of the Rev. J. Keble are well worthy of consideration by those who fear lest the admission of the Laity to an equal vote in our Synods, should almost forfeit our Catholic position. “Surely it is not a question which directly touches the faith. The voice of the Laity, in one form or another, has al-

ways been a most essential part of the voice of the whole Church. Even in the most vital case of fundamental Doctrine, the Church diffusive, in which the Laity are included, has a kind of veto, as I understand it, on the decision of a General Council. That decision does not become Ecumenical, until it has been accepted by the Holy Church throughout all the world. Now, if they have a negative voice, it is not, *prima facie*, essential at what stage in the discussion that voice is permitted to be heard. It may be a matter to be regulated according to times and seasons."—Letters p. 297.

N. B.—The above letter was written and intended to be published some three months ago. Now that I have declared my intention to resign this See it may be thought that I have lost my *right* to speak in this matter. But though I may have lost my *right*, the deep interest that I shall always feel in the Church of Canada will, I trust, plead my excuse for still allowing what I had written to be published.

A., Q.

June 16th, 1892.

Qu'Appelle, N. W. T.

RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD, AND DEAR BROTHER.

I have read with much interest your Address to the Synod of your Diocese concerning the Winnipeg Conference on the Consolidation of the Church in British North America.

As that part of your Address has been published by itself in pamphlet form, I presume that you desire it to be considered as addressed not merely to your own Diocese but to the Church in Canada generally. And the great importance of the subject, and the scheme you suggest, instead of that put forth by the Winnipeg Conference, certainly fully justifies such a step.

I trust, therefore, that you will not think that I am presuming if I venture to address you publicly with a few remarks on your comments on the scheme put forth by that Conference. I feel, indeed, that it may seem somewhat presumptuous in me to do so, when I remember the length of time that you have been a Bishop in this country, and the prominence of the position that you so worthily occupy, and my own very short service and my comparatively insignificant position. Nevertheless I feel that the question is one of such very grave importance to the future of our Church in this country that all personal considerations should be put aside. And I trust that the deep interest that I have felt in the question ever since I came to the country, and the fact that I am forced to regard it, in my distant and comparatively isolated sphere of work, from an altogether different point of view from which it is, perhaps, possible for you, from the centre of the Church life in the country, to look upon it, and because I fear that your great influence and authority may through this Address, be the means of postponing for a long period, if not of altogether thwarting hopes that seemed nearer being realized than could have been thought possible a few years ago, may be a sufficient excuse for any presumption there may be in my action.

As I read your Address I could not help feeling that your main argument against the Winnipeg scheme was based on an entire misapprehension (pardon me for so saying) of the real object and purpose of a General Synod as therein proposed.